

94/13

CALIFORNIA SCHOOLS

Volume IV

January, 1933

Number 1

CONTENTS

	Page
Directory of the State Department of Education.....	2
Current Issues of School Finance.....	3
California Teachers Association Resolutions on Financing Public Education.....	12
Data Relating to Districts Affected by Existing Teacher Tenure Legislation.....	13
New Regulations Governing Pupil Transportation.....	20
Departmental Communications.....	22
Interpretations of School Law.....	29
For Your Information.....	30
Professional Literature.....	34



**Official Publication Issued Monthly by the
California State Department of Education**

Entered as second-class matter May 8, 1930, at the Post Office at Sacramento, California,
under the Act of August 24, 1912

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

G. L. McLane, Route 1, Box 340, Fresno	(Term expires 1934)
Allen T. Archer, 215 West Sixth street, Los Angeles	(1935)
E. P. Clarke, Riverside	(1936)
Dr. Lewis P. Crutcher, Long Beach	(1936)
Miss Alice H. Dougherty, 4508 Pleasant Valley court, Oakland	(1936)
R. E. Golway, Sacramento	(1935)
Gordon Gray, Bank of America Building, San Diego	(1934)
Daniel C. Murphy, 90 Justin drive, San Francisco	(1934)
Miss Alice Rose Power, 233 Claremont, San Francisco	(1935)

STAFF

(Unless otherwise indicated all staff members may be reached at Sacramento)

Vierling Kersey, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Director of Education
Pauline Winner (Mrs.), Administrative Assistant
Alfred E. Lentz, Administrative Adviser
Marion H. Ketcham, Assistant Secretary and Principal Clerk, Public School Teachers' Retirement Salary Fund Board
Henry M. Lynn, Departmental Accountant
Sam H. Cohn, Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction
Walter E. Morgan, Assistant Superintendent of Public Instruction and Chief of Division of Research and Statistics
C. F. Muncy, Assistant Chief
Irene Taylor Heineman (Mrs.), Assistant Superintendent of Public Instruction, 311 California State Building, Los Angeles
Ivan R. Waterman, Chief of Division of Textbooks and Publications
W. S. Dyas, Chief of Bureau of State Printed Textbooks
Evelyn A. Clement (Mrs.), Chief of Division of Teacher Training and Certification
J. C. Beswick, Assistant Executive Officer, Commission for Vocational Education and Chief of Bureau of Trade and Industrial Education
Julian A. McPhee, Chief of Bureau of Agricultural Education
Ira W. Kibby, Chief of Bureau of Business Education
Maude I. Murchie, Chief of Bureau of Home-Making Education
H. D. Hicker, Chief of Bureau of Vocational Rehabilitation
J. M. Dodd, District Supervisor of Vocational Rehabilitation, 303 State Building, San Francisco
W. E. Smith, District Supervisor of Vocational Rehabilitation, 107 California State Building, Los Angeles
L. B. Travers, Chief of Division of Adult and Continuation Education, 311 California State Building, Los Angeles
Herbert R. Stolz, M.D., Chief of Bureau of Parent Education, 2739 Bancroft way, Berkeley
J. F. Dale, Bureau of Parent Education
Gertrude Laws, Bureau of Parent Education, 311 California State Building, Los Angeles
Magdalene Waner (Mrs.), Chief of Bureau of Immigrant Education, 315 State Building, San Francisco
Helen Heffernan, Chief of Division of Elementary Education and Rural Schools
Gladys L. Potter (Mrs.), Assistant Chief
N. P. Nellson, Chief of Division of Health and Physical Education
Winifred Van Hagen, Chief of Bureau of Physical Education for Girls
Mabel R. Gillis, State Librarian, Chief of Division of Libraries
Eleanor Hitt, Assistant Librarian
Andrew P. Hill, Jr., Chief of Division of Schoolhouse Planning
Charles W. Bursch, Assistant Chief
J. A. Burkman, Research Expert and Adviser for Teachers Colleges
Nicholas Ricciardi, Chief of Division of Secondary Education
_____, Chief of Division of Special Education
R. S. French, Chief of Bureau for the Education of the Blind, Principal California School for the Blind, Berkeley
Elwood A. Stevenson, Chief of Bureau for the Education of the Deaf, Principal California School for the Deaf, Berkeley
Lillian B. Hill (Mrs.), Chief of Bureau of Mental Hygiene
Mabel F. Gifford (Mrs.), Chief of Bureau of Correction of Speech Defects, Suite 305 Stanford Court, California and Powell Streets, San Francisco

Current Issues of School Finance

By VIERLING KERSEY, *Superintendent of Public Instruction*

With the convening of the 1933 Legislature, there are several important educational issues which the people of California, through their duly elected representatives, will be called upon to face. The most important of all educational issues at the present time are those relating to school finance, since the continued welfare of public education in California is dependent upon the continuance of adequate support. Two issues in particular are of paramount importance and of immediate concern to all persons interested in the educational welfare of the state.

Financial issues most important facing education today

Two financial issues of paramount importance

The first of these issues is that of state support of the public school system. At present, the Constitution¹ guarantees that the state shall contribute a minimum of \$30 per unit of average daily attendance in public elementary and high schools as its share of the cost of maintaining the public school system. There are current proposals, which already have received widespread publicity, to either decrease this guarantee or to eliminate it from the Constitution.

First major issue concerned with guarantee of state support of public schools

The second major issue concerns the control of local school budgets. The School Code now provides² that governing boards of school districts, as direct representatives of the people, shall determine the amounts of local school budgets. It is now being proposed that school budgets should be removed from the control of local governing boards and placed under the control of some other agency. County and state boards of budget review with power to revise school budgets have been proposed.

Second major issue that of control of school district budgets

It is the purpose of this article to analyze the nature of these proposals, and the effects which their adoption would have on public education in California, and further to present recommendations with regard to the action which should be taken relative to the state support of the public school system and the control of school district budgets.

¹ California Constitution, Article IX, section 6.

² School Code section 4.373.

CONSTITUTIONAL GUARANTEE OF STATE SUPPORT FOR EDUCATION

Current proposals to reduce or eliminate present constitutional guarantee of state support of schools

The people of California in 1920, by initiative action, passed proposal number 16 amending the Constitution to provide that the state shall contribute to the support of the public school system a minimum of \$30 per pupil in average daily attendance. There are two general proposals with reference to this provision. The first is that the present guarantee of \$30 per unit of average daily attendance be reduced by 20 per cent, or by some other amount. The second proposal is to eliminate entirely the constitutional guarantee of state support of public education, leaving the matter of state contributions for the support of schools to be determined by the Legislature each biennium.

Present system has high degree of stability although state school funds are inadequate in amount

The present system of school support in California assures a high degree of stability through the constitutional guarantee of state and county support, although the proportion of total school costs met from state revenues is far too low. California ranks high among the states of the Union with respect to the stability of her system of school support, and the degree of assurance that a definite amount of state aid will be received by each school district; but ranks rather low among the states on the basis of the proportion of school revenues derived from state sources.

Schools have retrenched in line with economic conditions. Many schools forced to eliminate essential educational activities

Present economic conditions have made it absolutely essential that education, together with all other governmental activities, be operated on a basis of strict economy. There is abundant evidence to show that the schools have met the emergency by severe retrenchments in expenditures. Many school districts, because of inadequate funds, have been forced to curtail educational offerings far beyond the point of sound economy and to eliminate essential activities from their school programs. Schools throughout the state have been sorely handicapped because of the decreased ability of local school districts to raise sufficient revenues through the general property tax. Property values have suffered material reductions during the past two years. Tax delinquencies have mounted rapidly. The extremely large share of the total burden of school support required to be met by county and school district taxes on common property, combined with the tremendously unequal distribution of wealth, has seriously threatened the survival of even the barest minimum educational programs in many communities.

In the face of conditions such as these come proposals to decrease or to eliminate the present guarantee of state support for education. To advocate such proposals is to court disaster. The acceptance of either proposal would mean ruin for many schools.

Proposals to reduce or eliminate present state guarantee of school support threaten disaster to schools

A reduction of the present constitutional guarantee for state support of education would inevitably lead to increased property taxes in local school districts, and to the further curtailment of educational programs which have already been reduced. At present approximately 85 per cent of all school district revenues are derived from county and school district taxes on real and personal property. Approximately 63 per cent of the total revenues are derived directly from the school districts themselves. A decrease in the present constitutional guarantee of \$30 per unit of average daily attendance, together with a corresponding decrease in the present county support, which is also proposed, would result in placing an overwhelming tax burden on the individual school districts of the state.

Reduction of present guarantee of state school would result in increased local property taxes and in reduced educational programs

The difference in financial ability among school districts is enormous. Large numbers of districts are now bearing intolerable tax burdens. In general, those districts with the highest tax rates are those in which the least satisfactory educational programs are offered. Even with the maximum legal rates many districts are unable to provide even the minimum educational opportunities for their children. A reduction of the present amount of state support for schools means a transfer of this burden to the local school districts. As a result, property taxes would be increased throughout the state. Those districts already levying the maximum legal tax rate would be forced to increase this rate beyond the ordinary maximum by a vote of the people or would be compelled to eliminate still further essential educational activities from the school programs.

The effect of such a proposal on the distribution of the tax burden between the operative property of the public service corporations and the non-operative real and personal property must also be considered. The present tax burden levied by counties, municipalities, school districts, and special districts on non-operative property is far in excess of that levied by the state on operative property. This condition has been true for many years and has been revealed by reports of tax commissions and reports of the State Board of Equalization.

Proposals antagonistic to equality of taxation between operative and non-operative property

The recent report of the California Tax Research Bureau, provided for by the last Legislature, confirms this fact. To reduce the present state contribution for education, together with other fixed charges as is proposed, with the resultant increase in property tax burdens would increase the inequalities now existing. Such a proposal is diametrically opposed to tax justice.

Adoption of proposals would remove stability from present system and lead to confusion in educational planning and procedures

The proposal to eliminate entirely the constitutional guarantee for state support of public schools is even more dangerous. Although the amount at present contributed by the state is inadequate and is responsible for the unequal and intolerable property tax burdens levied for school support by the counties and school districts of the state, the existing system has the virtue of stability. School district officials may now anticipate with accuracy the amounts to be received from state school funds. To remove the present guarantee of state school funds would be to remove the feature of stability from the present system of support. The element of uncertainty as to amounts to be received by school districts would be introduced. As a result it would be difficult if not impossible to predicate the tax rates which would be required of local school districts. It is highly probable that the amounts to be received from the state would fluctuate from year to year. During years when state support became low, district tax rates would need to be correspondingly high or educational programs would be curtailed. A fluctuating state school fund would lead directly to an unstable and varied educational program in every school district in the state. It would be impossible to develop and maintain long term educational policies. Instability in the system of educational support would surely lead to confusion and chaos in educational programs throughout the state.

Elimination of present guarantees would place schools in politics and at mercy of political forces

It is proposed to substitute biennial legislative appropriations for the present constitutional guarantee of the state support for education. The adequacy of state funds for school support would depend on competition with all other agencies of state government. The schools would of necessity be forced into state politics and compelled to maintain a lobby in the Legislature to work continually in the interests of adequate support for schools. The only other alternative is that the schools would be placed in the position of having to accept whatever might remain after strong organized minorities with powerful political influence had succeeded in securing appro-

priations for other purposes. This would place the schools almost entirely at the mercy of political forces. Either alternative is unacceptable. It is unthinkable that the schools should be placed at the mercy of political forces. It is abhorrent to contemplate an educational lobby forced to struggle constantly with political groups in order that public education might receive adequate state support.

The people of California have already expressed themselves on the matter of assured state support. By constitutional amendment they have provided for \$30 per pupil in average daily attendance to be paid from state funds. As early as 1910, the people wrote into the Constitution the provision making education the first responsibility of the state by requiring that moneys to be applied to the support of the public school system and the state university should constitute a prior claim upon the revenues of the state.¹ There is no evidence to show that the people of California have altered their opinion with regard to these matters.

The principle that education is a state function is firmly embedded in California tradition and practice. The reduction of state support for education would be an act of repudiation of this basic principle. It would tend to make education a local rather than a state responsibility. Wealthy communities would be in a position to maintain fine schools. The children of poor communities would be deprived of their right to enjoy satisfactory educational opportunities. No longer would all the children of the state be insured adequate schools. Instead of equal educational opportunities for all children, or a condition even approaching this ideal, the educational rights of pupils would be almost entirely dependent upon the financial ability of the district in which they attended school.

Improvement in the present system of support for public education depends upon a material increase, not a decrease, in the percentage of school revenues now derived from state sources. It is also necessary to provide for the apportionment of state school funds in such a manner as to equalize educational opportunities and school tax burdens among the school districts and counties of the state. The whole matter of a state tax plan is necessarily involved in consideration of the improvement of the present system of school support. It is well known that the taxes now levied on common property in the state are excessively high in comparison with tax burdens

People of California have firmly enunciated principle of state guarantee for school support

Adoption of proposals would violate principle of education as a state function and make impossible equality of educational opportunity

Improvement in present system of school support depends upon increase in amount of support contributed by state, apportionment of state school funds on equalization basis, and revision of state tax system

¹ California Constitution, Article XIII, section 14e.

placed on other forms of wealth. This fact has been pointed out by the various commissions which have studied California's tax problems. There is urgent need for immediate revision of the present state tax plan in order to distribute the tax burden more equitably upon the wealth of the state.

Any retrenchment in school expenditures should be made by reducing amounts contributed by school districts and thus lowering district taxes on property

The adoption of any proposal to diminish the amount of state aid now guaranteed for the support of public schools or to eliminate present requirements from the Constitution is a backward step. It is not a question of whether or not educational expenditures should be decreased. Retrenchments in school budgets have been made during the past biennium throughout the state. If further retrenchment must be made, the reductions should be effected by decreasing the contributions made by local school districts and thus decreasing the present excessive school district tax rates on common property. The proportion of total school revenues derived from the state is far too low. In districts where further economies can be effected, school district budgets may be decreased by lowering district tax rates, and the reductions would thus be a direct benefit to local taxpayers. Any reduction of the present inadequate state funds would prove disastrous to public education in California.

Educational welfare of state, not political expediency, should dominate consideration of proposals by Legislature

In considering such proposals as have been made to reduce state appropriations for education, the Legislature should carefully study the factual information with reference to the present system of educational support. The Legislature should make its decisions in the interests of the educational welfare of the state rather than upon the insistence of political groups representing the entrenched interests of organized minorities.

CONTROL OF SCHOOL DISTRICT BUDGETS

Proposals are currently made to remove control of school budgets from governing boards of school districts

Several proposals to remove control of school district budgets from the direct representatives of the people of the school districts have been given wide publicity during recent months. These proposals, although made in the name of efficiency, clearly have as their primary purpose the reduction of school budgets. It is proposed that local school boards already established for the specific purpose of controlling the management of both schools and school budgets be supplanted by new agencies in the form of boards of budget control, entirely independent of the people of local school communities. Such

boards through the control of school budgets would exercise actual control over the programs of the public schools.

Similar proposals made during past legislative sessions have been defeated. The people, through their legislative representatives, have held fast to the principle of direct control of school affairs by governing boards directly responsible to the people, and have very carefully avoided placing the control of public education in the hands of outside agencies. The continued attempts to alter present democratic methods for the management of schools have met with severe disapproval.

Similar proposals in past have been defeated

The admitted purpose of current proposals to set up boards of budget review is to curtail school budgets. That, however, is not the main issue involved. There already exists ample and excellent provision for effecting any reduction in school expenditures that the people desire. Governing boards of school districts, as direct representatives of the people, have full and complete power to effect any reductions which may be desired. There is every evidence that these governing boards have been and always are responsive to the will of the people.

Purpose of proposals to curtail school expenditures. Adequate provision already exists to accomplish this purpose

To further insure that local school budgets will reflect the desire of the people, provision¹ has been made for public hearings in which the people are given opportunity to participate in a full and complete discussion of school district budgets. Thus those who pay school district taxes have a voice in determining the amount of school district budgets.

Budget hearings provide means for people to be heard

The real issue involved is not one of retrenchment in school expenditures, but rather that of school management. Are the schools of the state to continue to remain under the immediate control of the direct representatives of the people, the governing boards of school districts, or are they to be controlled in large part by boards of budget review not immediately responsible to the people of the district and who lack information and a proper appreciation of educational needs and problems.

Real issue not one of retrenchment, but of organization for school management

The administration of public education offers the best example of democratic control and management of any governmental function. School districts have been established as direct agencies of the state for the specific purpose of providing local management of the state program of education. Governing boards of school districts are directly responsible to the people of their districts. The schools have purposely

Schools now removed from political control

¹ School Code section 4.353

been removed from political control and from the influence of political bodies. The progress made in public education in California is due in no small degree to the system provided for educational administration, particularly to the freedom of education from politics.

Proposals
would
inject
politics
into
manage-
ment and
operation
of school
affairs

The adoption of any proposal to establish a board of budgetary review with power to revise school district budgets would inject politics into the management of schools. The direct representatives of the people would be forced to submit their proposals to the approval of a more remote body before action could be taken. Organized minorities with political power and political preference would have every advantage before such boards of budget review. The schools, which are now very close to the people, both in the function they perform and in the organization provided for their management would undoubtedly suffer. Such proposals do violence to accepted principles of democratic control of education.

Separation
of
fiscal
control
from
educational
manage-
ment
would
lead to
confusion
in con-
duct of
public
education

Furthermore, the separation of the management of school affairs from the control of the school budget is opposed to sound principles of administration. These proposals would set up a board to pass on matters of educational expenditures which would be entirely apart from the board which directs educational policy. It is plainly evident that boards of budget review with powers to determine the amounts of school budgets would actually be vested with the ultimate control of education. Governing boards of school districts which are responsible to the people for the efficient management of the schools would be severely handicapped. There is implied in these proposals a dual control of school affairs to replace the present system of unified control. It is impossible to separate educational management from fiscal control and retain efficiency. The establishment of boards of budget review could lead only to the subversion of educational policies to financial considerations and political influence and to lack of coordination and to confusion in the conduct of public education.

RESPONSIBILITY OF EDUCATORS

Respon-
sibility of
educators
to inform
public of
nature of
proposals
and
dangers
involved

It is the responsibility of every school teacher and administrator in the state to see that the public is completely informed of the nature of these proposals and of the dire consequences which would result from their adoption. The proposals emanate from groups which have as their primary purpose the reduction of public expenditures, including those

for public schools, without due regard for the adequacy of service to be performed. The disastrous results of such proposals have either not been foreseen by these advocates, or, if realized, have been deliberately ignored. Purely fiscal considerations have been placed above the educational welfare of the state.

So far as is known, none of the educational groups or persons primarily interested in the welfare of public education has thus far been consulted with reference to these proposals. The proposals ignore the fact that already there exists adequate machinery for making reductions in school budgets by those best able to make intelligent decisions with regard to reductions in school budgets, namely, the governing boards of the school districts of the state; and further ignore the necessity for thorough revision of the present state tax plan to distribute the total burden of taxation within the state on an equitable basis.

The results of the adoption of any proposal to curtail state support for education or to remove the control of school district budgets from the people of the district should be made quite clear. The dangers of injecting politics into the management of school fiscal policies can not be over emphasized. Above all, the necessity for retaining democratic control of public education and the need for guaranteed undiminished state support should be made known to all citizens.

Statistical information showing the increased burden of taxes in local districts and figures showing what educational services would need to be eliminated due to curtailed incomes as a result of these proposals should be prepared and presented.

The people of California realize the importance of education and recognize the necessity for the state to insure its support. If the people are in possession of factual information showing the evil effects of the proposals herein discussed, they will not countenance their adoption.

Educational groups not consulted in preparation of proposals

Dangers involve injecting politics in schools and jeopardizing state support of schools

Factual information should be presented to public

People if in possession of facts regarding effects of proposals would vigorously oppose their adoption

California Teachers Association Resolutions on Financing Public Education

The following resolutions on the subject of financing public education in California were adopted by the California Council of Education of the California Teachers Association in meeting December 3, 1932. These resolutions are of special import during this period of economic stress and should command the careful consideration of all those interested in the welfare of public education in California:

1. We, the California Council of Education, recognizing the fact that the continued welfare of public education in California is almost entirely dependent at this particular time upon continuance of the present constitutional and statutory guarantees of school support, therefore consider that all other problems now facing public education and the teaching profession must be subordinated in our legislative program to this most urgent consideration.

2. We reaffirm our belief in the principle of the equitable distribution of the burden of school support and in the necessity for material increase in the share of the support of public education now contributed by this state.

3. Recognizing the increasingly unequal distribution of the burden of taxes for governmental support in California and the imperative need, especially during this period, for basic revision of the tax system, we therefore recommend to the members of the California Legislature a program of tax legislation based upon the factual data contained in the current report of the California State Tax Research Bureau. We further recommend that the State Legislature give immediate consideration to recommendations which have been made repeatedly by the several legislative tax commissions, the reports of which have been filed with the Legislature during the past decade. We strongly urge the enactment of legislation which will correct the major inequalities of the present tax system.

4. The California Council of Education expresses its unalterable opposition to proposals currently made which would result in a material reduction in the funds available for the support of public education. These proposals would inevitably result both in a curtailment of the educational opportunity of an entire generation of California children and in an increase in the already oppressive burden of taxes on common property.

The California Council of Education directs that there be given to the public the factual information now available showing that any reduction in the statutory requirements for state and county school support would require either a considerable increase in district property taxes or, where such taxes are already at the maximum, a drastic curtailment in the total school support available with resulting elimination of absolutely necessary school activities.

5. We reaffirm our conviction that the welfare of the public schools requires the continuation of the present democratic control of public education by school boards selected by the people for this specific purpose. We, therefore, pledge our active resistance to any legislative proposals to transfer control of school district budgets to any other agency.

6. In view of the improvements effected in the educational programs in the rural areas of California through the professional direction afforded by our present system of rural school supervision, we disapprove any attempts to remove this essential service.

Data Relating to Districts Affected by Existing Teacher Tenure Legislation

The provisions of School Code sections 5.500-5.501 relating to permanent tenure of teachers authorize governing boards of school districts having an average daily attendance of less than 850 to grant permanent tenure to teachers within their own discretion, but require that all teachers employed for the fourth consecutive year in districts having 850 or more pupils in average daily attendance be classified as permanent teachers. Numerous questions have been asked from time to time relative to the number of districts, teachers, and pupils affected by these provisions of the School Code. The following tabulations present these data by counties for the school year 1931-1932.

In Table No. 1 figures are given showing the number and percentage of districts of each type segregated as having less than 850 pupils in average daily attendance or 850 or more pupils in average daily attendance. Table No. 2 shows the total number of certificated employees in each county in districts of less than 850 pupils in average daily attendance and in districts of 850 or more pupils in average daily attendance, together with the percentage of the total number of certificated employees of the entire county employed in each of these types of district. In Table No. 3 are shown the number of pupils in average daily attendance in each type of district and the percentage of the total average daily attendance of the county in districts of each of these size groups.

Of the total 3071 districts of all types which actually maintained school in 1931-32, a total of 149 or less than 5 per cent were in the group classified as having an average daily attendance of 850 or more. These districts employed over two-thirds of the certificated employees and enrolled nearly 71 per cent of the total average daily attendance of the state.

Thus, while the present mandatory requirements of the "tenure laws" might appear, from the small percentage of the districts of the state directly affected thereby, not to be widespread in their effect, it is seen that these laws do definitely affect the districts in which a large majority of teachers are employed and pupils are in attendance. From the point of view of the average rural school district, however, it would appear from these tabulations that the "tenure laws" as at present constituted need have no effect whatever, the only districts which should be particularly concerned over the operation of these laws being those largest of the districts which constitute less than 5 per cent of the total.

TABLE No. 1

Number and Per Cent of Elementary School, High School, and Junior College Districts Having Less Than 850 and Having 850 or More Units of Average Daily Attendance, by Counties, 1931-1932

Counties	Elementary school districts				High school districts			
	With less than 850 A. D. A.		With 850 A. D. A. or more		With less than 850 A. D. A.		With 850 A. D. A. or more	
	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent
Alameda.....	36	83.7	7	16.3	6	60.0	4	40.0
Alpine.....	3	100.0						
Amador.....	25	100.0			3	100.0		
Butte.....	51	96.2	2	3.8	4	80.0	1	20.0
Calaveras.....	32	100.0			2	100.0		
Colusa.....	21	100.0			5	100.0		
Contra Costa.....	44	93.6	3	6.4	7	87.5	1	12.5
Del Norte.....	13	100.0			1	100.0		
El Dorado.....	48	100.0			1	100.0		
Fresno.....	141	99.3	1	0.7	16	94.1	1	5.9
Glenn.....	33	100.0			3	100.0		
Humboldt.....	100	99.0	1	0.1	4	80.0	1	20.0
Imperial.....	38	92.7	3	7.3	6	100.0		
Inyo.....	19	100.0			4	100.0		
Kern.....	82	97.6	2	2.4	4	66.7	2	33.3
Kings.....	33	97.1	1	2.9	3	100.0		
Lake.....	17	100.0			5	100.0		
Lassen.....	32	100.0			2	100.0		
Los Angeles.....	92	79.3	24	20.7	12	46.2	14	53.8
Madera.....	43	97.7	1	2.3	3	100.0		
Marin.....	43	100.0			2	66.7	1	33.3
Mariposa.....	25	100.0			1	100.0		
Mendocino.....	80	100.0			8	100.0		
Merced.....	57	98.3	1	1.7	5	83.3	1	16.7
Modoc.....	39	100.0			3	100.0		
Mono.....	8	100.0						
Monterey.....	59	96.7	2	3.3	5	100.0		
Napa.....	36	97.3	1	2.7	3	100.0		
Nevada.....	29	100.0			3	100.0		
Orange.....	37	86.0	6	14.0	9	81.8	2	18.2
Placer.....	40	97.6	1	2.4	3	100.0		
Plumas.....	27	100.0			1	100.0		
Riverside.....	49	96.1	2	3.9	9	90.0	1	10.0
Sacramento.....	60	96.8	2	3.2	6	85.7	1	14.3
San Benito.....	30	100.0			1	100.0		
San Bernardino.....	60	92.3	5	7.7	5	62.5	3	37.5
San Diego.....	76	97.4	2	2.6	8	80.0	2	20.0
San Francisco.....			1	100.0			1	100.0
San Joaquin.....	75	96.2	3	3.8	6	85.7	1	14.3
San Luis Obispo.....	65	98.5	1	1.5	6	100.0		
San Mateo.....	28	84.8	5	15.2	4	66.7	2	33.3
Santa Barbara.....	41	95.3	2	4.7	4	80.0	1	20.0
Santa Clara.....	53	94.6	3	5.4	7	88.8	2	22.2
Santa Cruz.....	44	95.7	2	4.3	2	66.7	1	33.3
Shasta.....	85	100.0			3	100.0		
Sierra.....	10	100.0			1	100.0		
Siskiyou.....	74	100.0			3	100.0		
Solano.....	39	97.5	1	2.5	5	83.3	1	16.7
Sonoma.....	117	99.2	1	0.8	5	81.4	2	28.6
Stanislaus.....	50	96.2	2	3.8	7	87.5	1	12.5
Sutter.....	28	100.0			3	100.0		
Tehama.....	47	100.0			2	100.0		
Trinity.....	23	100.0			1	100.0		
Tulare.....	101	96.2	4	3.8	8	80.0	2	20.0
Tuolumne.....	26	100.0			2	100.0		
Ventura.....	38	92.7	3	7.3	6	85.7	1	14.3
Yolo.....	35	100.0			5	100.0		
Yuba.....	27	100.0			2	100.0		
Totals.....	2664	96.6	95	3.4	245	83.1	50	16.9

TABLE No. 1—Continued

Number and Per Cent of Elementary School, High School, and Junior College Districts Having Less Than 850 and Having 850 or More Units of Average Daily Attendance, by Counties, 1931-1932

Counties	Junior college districts				Total districts			
	With less than 850 A. D. A.		With 850 A. D. A. or more		With less than 850 A. D. A.		With 850 A. D. A. or more	
	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent
Alameda					42	79.2	11	20.8
Alpine					3	100.0		
Amador					28	100.0		
Butte					55	94.8	3	5.2
Calaveras					34	100.0		
Colusa					26	100.0		
Contra Costa					51	92.7	4	7.3
Del Norte					14	100.0		
El Dorado					49	100.0		
Fresno					157	98.7	2	1.3
Glenn					36	100.0		
Humboldt					104	98.1	2	1.9
Imperial					44	93.6	3	6.4
Inyo					23	100.0		
Kern					86	95.6	4	4.4
Kings					36	97.3	1	2.7
Lake					22	100.0		
Lassen					34	100.0		
Los Angeles	2	40.0	3	60.0	106	72.1	41	27.9
Madera					46	97.9	1	2.1
Marin	1	100.0			46	97.9	1	2.1
Mariposa					26	100.0		
Mendocino					88	100.0		
Merced					62	96.9	2	3.1
Modoc					42	100.0		
Mono					8	100.0		
Monterey					64	97.0	2	3.0
Napa					39	97.5	1	2.5
Nevada					32	100.0		
Orange	2	100.0			48	85.7	8	14.3
Placer					43	97.7	1	2.3
Plumas					28	100.0		
Riverside	1	100.0			59	95.2	3	4.8
Sacramento			1	100.0	66	94.3	4	5.7
San Benito					31	100.0		
San Bernardino	2	100.0			67	89.3	8	10.7
San Diego					84	95.5	4	4.5
San Francisco							2	100.0
San Joaquin					81	95.3	4	4.7
San Luis Obispo					71	98.6	1	1.4
San Mateo	1	100.0			33	82.5	7	17.5
Santa Barbara					45	93.8	3	6.2
Santa Clara	1	100.0			61	92.4	5	7.6
Santa Cruz					46	93.9	3	6.1
Shasta					88	100.0		
Sierra					11	100.0		
Siskiyou					77	100.0		
Solano					44	95.7	2	4.3
Sonoma	1	100.0			123	97.6	3	2.4
Stanislaus	1	100.0			58	95.1	3	4.9
Sutter					31	100.0		
Tehama					49	100.0		
Trinity					24	100.0		
Tulare					109	94.8	6	5.2
Tuolumne					28	100.0		
Ventura					44	91.7	4	8.3
Yolo					40	100.0		
Yuba	1	100.0			30	100.0		
Totals	13	76.5	4	23.5	2922	95.1	140	4.9

TABLE No. 2

Number and Per Cent of Certificated Employees in Elementary School, High School, and Junior College Districts of Less Than 850 and of 850 or More Units of Average Daily Attendance, by Counties, 1931-1932

Counties	Certificated employees in elementary school districts				Certificated employees in high school districts			
	With less than 850 A.D.A.		With 850 A. D. A. or more		With less than 850 A. D. A.		With 850 A. D. A. or more	
	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Percent
Alameda.....	175	55.8	1,387	44.2	176	8.9	1,795	91.1
Alpine.....	3	100.0						
Amador.....	45	100.0			24	100.0		
Butte.....	100	49.3	103	50.7	75	56.4	58	43.6
Calaveras.....	42	100.0			19	100.0		
Colusa.....	70	100.0			52	100.0		
Contra Costa.....	197	52.0	182	48.0	266	65.5	140	34.5
Del Norte.....	34	100.0			13	100.0		
El Dorado.....	64	100.0			18	100.0		
Fresno.....	540	70.9	222	29.1	366	53.0	324	47.0
Glenn.....	85	100.0			48	100.0		
Humboldt.....	178	79.1	47	20.9	68	52.3	62	47.7
Imperial.....	175	54.0	149	46.0	148	100.0		
Inyo.....	41	100.0			28	100.0		
Kern.....	304	55.9	240	44.1	98	21.8	350	78.2
Kings.....	107	72.3	41	27.7	98	100.0		
Lake.....	50	100.0			32	100.0		
Lassen.....	75	100.0			52	100.0		
Los Angeles.....	818	9.7	7,644	90.3	518	6.2	7,784	93.8
Madera.....	88	72.1	34	27.9	56	100.0		
Marin.....	150	100.0			44	37.6	73	62.4
Mariposa.....	28	100.0			9	100.0		
Mendocino.....	156	100.0			108	100.0		
Merced.....	188	81.6	42	18.4	71	54.2	60	45.8
Modoc.....	57	100.0			25	100.0		
Mono.....	10	100.0						
Monterey.....	209	69.2	93	30.8	206	100.0		
Napa.....	65	65.7	34	34.3	61	100.0		
Nevada.....	62	100.0			27	100.0		
Orange.....	352	47.4	390	52.6	239	46.2	278	53.8
Placer.....	116	75.8	37	24.2	108	100.0		
Plumas.....	43	100.0			20	100.0		
Riverside.....	215	53.1	190	46.9	156	48.3	167	51.7
Sacramento.....	249	40.1	372	59.9	65	14.9	370	85.1
San Benito.....	77	100.0			31	100.0		
San Bernardino.....	219	36.4	382	63.6	101	22.1	357	77.9
San Diego.....	264	34.6	499	65.4	188	22.7	639	77.3
San Francisco.....			1,465	100.0			1,305	100.0
San Joaquin.....	204	40.1	305	59.9	136	41.6	191	58.4
San Luis Obispo.....	138	79.3	36	20.7	142	100.0		
San Mateo.....	114	32.5	237	67.5	66	24.6	202	75.4
Santa Barbara.....	145	47.5	160	52.5	130	43.2	171	56.8
Santa Clara.....	356	54.6	296	45.4	181	29.6	430	70.4
Santa Cruz.....	82	50.6	80	49.4	44	31.0	98	69.0
Shasta.....	113	100.0			42	100.0		
Sierra.....	15	100.0			8	100.0		
Siskiyou.....	174	100.0			120	100.0		
Solano.....	101	69.2	45	30.8	58	40.3	86	59.7
Sonoma.....	219	73.5	79	26.5	107	45.3	129	54.7
Stanislaus.....	208	63.0	122	37.0	134	65.0	72	35.0
Sutter.....	89	100.0			68	100.0		
Tehama.....	98	100.0			53	100.0		
Trinity.....	27	100.0			5	100.0		
Tulare.....	304	65.8	158	34.2	175	60.6	114	39.4
Tuolumne.....	52	100.0			29	100.0		
Ventura.....	191	59.3	131	40.7	153	51.3	145	48.7
Yolo.....	127	100.0			82	100.0		
Yuba.....	67	100.0			57	100.0		
Totals.....	8,473	35.8	15,202	64.2	5,404	26.0	15,400	74.0

TABLE No. 2—Continued

Number and Per Cent of Certificated Employees in Elementary School, High School, and Junior College Districts of Less Than 850 and of 850 or More Units of Average Daily Attendance, by Counties, 1931-1932

Counties	Certificated employees in junior college districts				Total certificated employees in all districts			
	With less than 850 A. D. A.		With 850 A. D. A. or more		With less than 850 A. D. A.		With 850 A. D. A. or more	
	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent
Alameda.....					351	9.9	3,182	90.1
Alpine.....					3	100.0		
Amador.....					69	100.0		
Butte.....					175	52.1	161	47.9
Calaveras.....					61	100.0		
Colusa.....					122	100.0		
Contra Costa.....					463	59.0	322	41.0
Del Norte.....					47	100.0		
El Dorado.....					82	100.0		
Fresno.....					906	62.4	546	37.6
Glenn.....					133	100.0		
Humboldt.....					246	69.3	109	30.7
Imperial.....					323	68.4	149	31.6
Inyo.....					69	100.0		
Kern.....					402	40.5	590	59.5
Kings.....					205	83.3	41	16.7
Lake.....					82	100.0		
Lassen.....					127	100.0		
Los Angeles.....	64	18.5	282	81.5	1,400	8.2	15,710	91.8
Madera.....					144	80.9	34	19.1
Marin.....	22	100.0			216	74.7	73	25.3
Mariposa.....					37	100.0		
Mendocino.....					264	100.0		
Merced.....					257	71.6	102	28.4
Modoc.....					82	100.0		
Mono.....					10	100.0		
Monterey.....					415	81.7	93	18.3
Napa.....					126	78.8	34	21.2
Nevada.....					89	100.0		
Orange.....	63	100.0			654	49.5	668	50.5
Placer.....					224	85.8	37	14.2
Plumas.....					63	100.0		
Riverside.....	43	100.0			414	53.7	357	46.3
Sacramento.....			68	100.0	314	27.9	810	72.1
San Benito.....					108	100.0		
San Bernardino.....	82	100.0			402	35.2	739	64.8
San Diego.....					452	28.4	1,138	71.6
San Francisco.....							2,770	100.0
San Joaquin.....					340	40.7	496	59.3
San Luis Obispo.....					280	88.6	36	11.4
San Mateo.....	50	100.0			230	34.4	439	65.6
Santa Barbara.....					275	45.4	331	54.6
Santa Clara.....	34	100.0			571	44.0	726	56.0
Santa Cruz.....					126	41.4	178	58.6
Shasta.....					155	100.0		
Sierra.....					23	100.0		
Siakiyou.....					204	100.0		
Solano.....					159	54.8	131	45.2
Sonoma.....	17	100.0			343	62.3	208	37.7
Stanislaus.....	43	100.0			385	66.5	194	33.5
Sutter.....					157	100.0		
Tehama.....					151	100.0		
Trinity.....					32	100.0		
Tulare.....					479	63.8	272	36.2
Tuolumne.....					81	100.0		
Ventura.....					344	55.5	276	44.5
Yolo.....					209	100.0		
Yuba.....	29	100.0			153	100.0		
Totals.....	44.7	56.1	350	43.9	14,324	31.6	30,952	68.4

TABLE No. 3

Number and Per Cent of Pupils in Average Daily Attendance in Elementary School, High School, and Junior College Districts Having Less Than 850 and Having 850 or More Units of Average Daily Attendance, by Counties, 1931-1932

Counties	A. D. A. in elementary school districts				A. D. A. in high school districts			
	With less than 850 A. D. A.		With 850 A. D. A. or more		With less than 850 A. D. A.		With 850 A. D. A. or more	
	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent
Alameda	4,558	10.6	38,282	89.4	2,755	8.0	31,736	92.0
Alpine	27	100.0						
Amador	952	100.0			332	100.0		
Butte	2,223	43.4	2,900	56.6	1,034	52.2	945	47.8
Calaveras	695	100.0			253	100.0		
Colusa	1,351	100.0			507	100.0		
Contra Costa	5,154	49.3	5,290	50.7	2,704	54.2	2,285	45.8
Del Norte	657	100.0			206	100.0		
El Dorado	1,066	100.0			330	100.0		
Fresno	13,959	67.1	6,857	32.9	4,696	42.5	6,366	57.5
Glenn	1,729	100.0			684	100.0		
Humboldt	3,676	70.6	1,534	29.4	1,064	42.6	1,431	57.4
Imperial	5,091	52.5	4,601	47.5	2,032	100.0		
Inyo	863	100.0			247	100.0		
Kern	7,096	54.6	5,900	45.4	826	16.2	4,278	83.8
Kings	2,987	69.0	1,344	31.0	1,365	100.0		
Lake	1,072	100.0			371	100.0		
Lassen	1,588	100.0			763	100.0		
Los Angeles	19,878	9.2	195,423	90.8	5,630	4.0	136,796	96.0
Madera	2,009	66.2	1,028	33.8	867	100.0		
Marin	3,966	100.0			642	37.1	1,087	62.9
Mariposa	423	100.0			96	100.0		
Mendocino	3,025	100.0			1,401	100.0		
Merced	4,947	80.6	1,187	19.4	958	49.3	984	50.7
Modoc	962	100.0			304	100.0		
Mono	134	100.0			6	100.0		
Monterey	4,777	64.5	2,630	35.5	1,993	100.0		
Napa	1,225	54.1	1,039	45.9	832	100.0		
Nevada	1,346	100.0			519	100.0		
Orange	7,850	46.4	9,052	53.6	3,949	58.1	3,096	43.9
Placer	2,846	72.6	1,075	27.4	1,259	100.0		
Plumas	806	100.0			233	100.0		
Riverside	5,793	54.4	4,861	45.6	1,955	41.7	2,735	58.3
Sacramento	6,103	38.7	9,676	61.3	1,014	13.1	6,732	86.9
San Benito	1,690	100.0			546	100.0		
San Bernardino	6,245	36.1	11,038	63.9	1,582	19.9	6,365	80.1
San Diego	7,076	33.5	14,049	66.5	2,418	18.4	10,712	81.6
San Francisco			42,001	100.0			27,980	100.0
San Joaquin	5,518	38.6	8,792	61.4	1,971	41.1	2,821	58.9
San Luis Obispo	2,715	76.9	816	23.1	1,565	100.0		
San Mateo	2,907	28.2	7,417	71.8	1,012	26.9	2,745	73.1
Santa Barbara	3,165	44.3	3,983	55.7	1,409	34.2	2,714	65.8
Santa Clara	9,722	53.7	8,388	46.3	2,503	27.4	6,625	72.6
Santa Cruz	2,019	45.3	2,439	54.7	856	38.7	1,358	61.3
Shasta	1,966	100.0			679	100.0		
Sierra	277	100.0			73	100.0		
Siakiyou	3,688	100.0			1,156	100.0		
Solano	2,650	64.4	1,462	35.6	750	33.5	1,489	66.5
Sonoma	6,246	81.6	1,414	18.4	1,114	33.8	2,180	66.2
Stanislaus	5,811	61.7	3,600	38.3	1,899	58.4	1,352	41.6
Sutter	2,327	100.0			702	100.0		
Tehama	1,986	100.0			714	100.0		
Trinity	352	100.0			64	100.0		
Tulare	8,368	63.6	4,784	36.4	2,515	56.4	1,943	43.6
Tuolumne	1,155	100.0			434	100.0		
Ventura	4,399	55.9	3,471	44.1	1,716	50.1	1,708	49.9
Yolo	3,262	100.0			877	100.0		
Yuba	1,502	100.0			531	100.0		
Totals	205,878	33.6	406,323	66.4	68,903	20.4	268,463	79.6

TABLE No. 3—Continued

Number and Per Cent of Pupils in Average Daily Attendance in Elementary School, High School, and Junior College Districts Having Less Than 850 and Having 850 or More Units of Average Daily Attendance, by Counties, 1931-1932

Counties	A. D. A. in junior college districts				Total A. D. A. in all districts			
	With less than 850 A. D. A.		With 850 A. D. A. or more		With less than 850 A. D. A.		With 850 A. D. A. or more	
	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent
Alameda					7,313	9.5	70,018	90.5
Alpine					27	100.0		
Amador					1,284	100.0		
Butte					3,257	45.9	3,845	54.1
Calaveras					948	100.0		
Colusa					1,858	100.0		
Contra Costa					7,858	50.9	7,575	49.1
Del Norte					863	100.0		
El Dorado					1,396	100.0		
Fresno					18,655	58.5	13,223	41.5
Glenn					2,413	100.0		
Humboldt					4,740	61.5	2,965	38.5
Imperial					7,123	60.8	4,601	39.2
Inyo					1,110	100.0		
Kern					7,922	43.8	10,178	56.2
Kings					4,352	76.4	1,344	23.6
Lake					1,443	100.0		
Lassen					2,341	100.0		
Los Angeles	1,106	13.8	6,910	86.2	26,614	7.3	339,129	92.7
Madera					2,876	73.7	1,028	26.3
Marin	427	100.0			5,035	82.2	1,087	17.8
Mariposa					519	100.0		
Mendocino					4,426	100.0		
Merced					5,905	73.1	2,171	26.9
Modoc					1,266	100.0		
Mono					140	100.0		
Monterey					6,770	72.0	2,630	28.0
Napa					2,057	66.4	1,039	33.6
Nevada					1,865	100.0		
Orange	1,205	100.0			13,004	51.7	12,148	48.3
Placer					4,105	79.2	1,075	20.8
Plumas					1,039	100.0		
Riverside	423	100.0			8,171	51.9	7,586	48.1
Sacramento			1,577	100.0	7,117	28.4	17,985	71.6
San Benito					2,236	100.0		
San Bernardino	1,258	100.0			9,085	34.3	17,403	65.7
San Diego					9,494	27.7	24,761	72.3
San Francisco							69,981	100.0
San Joaquin					7,489	39.2	11,613	60.8
San Luis Obispo					4,290	84.0	816	16.0
San Mateo	786	100.0			4,705	31.6	10,162	68.4
Santa Barbara					4,574	40.6	6,697	59.4
Santa Clara	705	100.0			12,930	46.3	15,013	53.7
Santa Cruz					2,875	43.1	3,797	56.9
Shasta					2,645	100.0		
Sierra					350	100.0		
Siskiyou					4,842	100.0		
Solano					3,400	53.5	2,951	46.5
Sonoma	326	100.0			7,686	68.1	3,594	31.9
Stanislaus	784	100.0			8,494	63.2	4,952	36.8
Sutter					3,029	100.0		
Tehama					2,700	100.0		
Trinity					416	100.0		
Tulare					10,883	61.8	6,727	38.2
Tuolumne					1,589	100.0		
Ventura					6,115	54.1	5,179	45.9
Yolo					4,139	100.0		
Yuba	186	100.0			2,219	100.0		
Totals	7,206	45.9	8,487	54.1	281,987	29.2	683,273	70.8

New Regulations Governing Pupil Transportation

The State Board of Education in regular meeting held October 7 and 8, 1932, adopted the following amendments to the State Board of Education Regulations Governing Pupil Transportation:¹

1. Subdivision "s" added to section 7 of the regulations reads as follows:

- s. Whenever a school bus stops at a point where traffic is not controlled by a human flagman or a clearly visible electrical or mechanical signal, to discharge passengers who must cross the road in order to reach their destination, such passengers must cross the road in front of the bus and the bus must not be started again until all such passengers have crossed the road. If necessary, the driver shall stop the engine of the bus and escort such passengers across the road.

2. In subdivision "c" of section 11 of the regulations the word "auxiliary" was substituted for the word "fog," said subdivision to read as follows:

- c. Each school bus shall also be equipped with auxiliary lamps approved by the Department of Motor Vehicles.

3. Subdivisions "x," "y," "z," and "aa" were added to section 11 of the regulations and read as follows:

- x. The maximum load placed upon the chassis of any school bus the purchase of which is contracted for after November 1, 1932, shall not at any time exceed the capacity of such chassis as fixed by the manufacturer thereof.
- y. No aisle in a school bus, the purchase of which is contracted for after November 1, 1932, shall be less than 12 inches in width.
- z. Jump seats may be used in school buses only as herein provided. All jump seats must be of upholstered boards, without backs. Their construction must be such as will permit easy placement or removal while obviating any danger of falling while in use. Jump seats must be left with the driver by passengers using them when leaving the bus and secured by passengers from the driver when needed.

¹ See Department of Education Bulletin No. 2, January 15, 1932, *The Regulation of Pupil Transportation*.

aa. A card shall be posted in each school bus upon which shall appear the capacity of the bus and a copy of section 12 of these regulations. The position of said card and the size of the letters and figures appearing thereon shall be such as will permit such card to be read by each passenger entering the bus.

4. Section 14 of the regulations is amended to read as follows:

Sec. 14. These rules and regulations have been developed for the purpose of minimizing the hazards and avoiding dangers involved in pupil transportation.

Exemption from any of the requirements of these regulations may be made by the Superintendent of Public Instruction, with the approval of the California Highway Patrol. Exemptions may be granted when it appears that the applicant is accomplishing the results intended to be attained by these regulations through the use of methods other than those herein specifically set forth. Exemption when granted may be rescinded at any time for good cause by the Superintendent of Public Instruction upon the recommendation of the California Highway Patrol.

DEPARTMENTAL COMMUNICATIONS

Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction

VIERLING KERSEY, Superintendent

RENEWAL OF SCHOOL BUS DRIVERS' CERTIFICATES

All school bus drivers' certificates issued prior to December, 1932, expire December 31, 1932, and are invalid after that date.

A school bus driver's certificate which expires on December 31, 1932, may be renewed by the holder thereof through the Captain of the California Highway Patrol in charge of the county in which the holder of the certificate resides, or through whom the certificate now held was issued.

Holders of school bus driver's certificates who were examined therefor prior to July 1, 1932, will be required to submit a physician's certificate as a condition precedent to renewal. No physician's certificate will be required from holders of school bus driver's certificates who were examined therefor on or after July 1, 1932, except in cases where the facts are such as to warrant the requiring of a physician's certificate.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION LAW

Employees of school districts are protected by the Workmen's Compensation Law.

Injuries suffered by employees of school districts while in the course of their employment should be immediately reported through the governing board of the district to the State Compensation Insurance Fund, State Building, San Francisco, on forms which will be supplied by the fund upon request.

Division of Research and Statistics

WALTER E. MORGAN, *Assistant Superintendent of Public Instruction, and Chief, Division of Research and Statistics*

STATE COORDINATING COMMITTEE TO REVISE SCHOOL FISCAL FORMS AND PROCEDURES

Recognizing the need for a complete revision in the county and school district financial records, forms, and procedures, the State Department of Education is organizing a State Coordinating Commit-

tee which will be charged with the responsibility of recommending changes to be made effective for the school year 1933-34. The first meeting of this committee will be held under the chairmanship of Walter E. Morgan, Assistant Superintendent of Public Instruction, at the Sir Francis Drake Hotel in San Francisco at 9:30 a.m., January 16, 1933.

At the meeting representatives of the several state-wide committees which have been studying the school district budget form and other matters of financial accounting and reporting will be asked to attend. The organizations represented will include the California Association of Public School Superintendents, the California Association of Public School Business Officials, the California Association of Secondary School Principals, and such other regional or local committees as may have a definite contribution to make. School administrators and business officials who desire to cooperate in this study are invited to attend.

It is the intention of the State Department of Education that a revised budget form shall be adopted and made available to school officials some time in March, 1933. Revised forms for district and county records of expenditures, revised annual reports of finances, and revised school district warrant forms should be recommended and adopted for use during the following school year.

JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT BOUNDARIES

Numerous questions have been received by the State Department of Education relative to the areas included in each of the junior college districts in the State. These questions have been raised because of the difficulty of determining whether individual students for whom a tuition charge is rendered to a particular county actually reside within the area of a junior college district or not. For this reason the following tabulation is presented showing the high school districts and elementary school districts included within each of the junior college districts.

CHAFFEY JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT

Chaffey Union High School District

Alta Loma
Camp Baldy
Central
Cucamonga
Etiwanda

Fontana
Mountain View
Ontario
Piedmont
Upland

COMPTON JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT

Compton Union High School District

Clearwater
Compton
Enterprise

Lynwood
Willowbrook

FULLERTON JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT**Fullerton Union High School District**

Buena Park

Fullerton

La Habra

Orangethorpe

Placentia Union

Commonwealth

Placentia

Richfield

Yorba

Yorba Linda

GLENDALE JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT**Glendale High School District**

Glendale

LONG BEACH JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT**Long Beach High School District**

Llewellyn

Long Beach

LOS ANGELES JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT**Los Angeles High School District**

Beverly Hills

Calabasas

Castaic Union

Castaic

Live Oak

Cornell

Culver City

Felton

Honby

Las Virgenes

Liberty

Los Angeles

New Era

Newhall

Palos Verdes

San Francisquito

Saugus

Topango

MARIN JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT**San Rafael High School District**

Dixie

Lagunitas

Loma Alta

San Jose

San Pedro

San Quentin

San Rafael

Tamalpais Union High School District

Angel Island

Belvedere

Bollinas Union

Bollinas

Wilkins

Fairfax

Fort Barry

Kentfield

Larkspur

Mill Valley

Ross

San Anselmo

Sausalito

Stinson Beach

Tiburon

MODESTO JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT**Modesto High School District**

Belpassi

Cole

Empire Union

Garner

New Hope

Fairview

Hart

Jackson

McHenry

Modesto

Paradise

Prescott

Ransom

Salida

Stanislaus

Stoddard

PASADENA JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT**Pasadena High School District**

La Canada
Pasadena

Sierra Madre
South Santa Anita

RIVERSIDE JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT**Riverside High School District**

Alvord
Ferndale
Glenavon
Highgrove
Jurupa Heights
Midland

Moreno
Riverside
Union Joint
(Riverside-San Bernardino)
West Riverside

SACRAMENTO JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT**Sacramento High School District**

Sacramento

SAN BERNARDINO VALLEY UNION JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT**Colton Union High School District**

Bloomington
Colton
San Salvador

Terrace Union
La Loma
Terrace

San Bernardino High School District

City Creek
Del Rosa
Highland
Lake Arrowhead
Mill

Rialto
San Bernardino
Summit
Warm Spring

SAN JOSE JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT**San Jose High School District**

San Jose

SAN MATEO JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT**San Mateo Union High School District**

Burlingame
Hillsborough
Millbrae

San Bruno Park
San Mateo

SANTA ANA JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT**Santa Ana High School District**

Diamond
Greenville

Paularino
Santa Ana

SANTA ROSA JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT**Analy Union High School District**

Burnside
Canfield
Duncans Mills
Eucalyptus
Forestville
Freestone
Gold Ridge
Green Valley
Guerneville

Hall
Jenner
Jonive
Kidd Creek
Montgomery
Mountain View
Mount Jackson
Mount Vernon
Oak Grove

Occidental
 Ocean
 Pleasant Hill
 Ridenhour
 Sebastopol Union
 Marshall
 Sebastopol

Sheridan
 Spring Hill
 Stony Point
 Vine Hill

Santa Rosa High School District

Alpine
 Brush
 Dunbar Union
 Los Guilicos
 Fulton
 Goodman (Suspended)
 Hearn
 Lewis
 Lone Redwood
 Los Alamos (Suspended)
 Mark West
 Monroe
 Olivet

Piner
 Reibli
 Rincon
 Roseland
 Santa Rosa
 Santa Rosa City
 Steuben
 Strawberry
 Tarwater
 Todd
 Wallace
 Wilford
 Wright

YUBA COUNTY JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT

Marysville Union High School District

Brophy
 Browns Valley
 Camptonville Union
 Celestial Valley
 Mill Creek
 Oak Valley
 Slate Range
 Challenge
 Cordua
 Dobbins
 Feather River Union
 Honcut
 Woodruff
 Fruitland Union
 Buckeye
 Sugar Loaf
 Goldfield

Greenville
 Hansonville
 Indiana Ranch
 Linda
 Long Bar
 Marigold
 Marysville
 New England Union
 Arboga
 Ella
 Oregon House
 Peoria
 Rose Bar
 Sharon Valley
 Spring Valley
 Strawberry Valley

Wheatland Union High School District

Elizabeth
 Plumas

Waldo
 Wheatland

Division of Textbooks and Publications

IVAN R. WATERMAN, Chief

NEW PUBLICATIONS

Attention is directed to the following new numbers of the *Department of Education Bulletin*:

No. 24, December 15, 1932. *Certain Factors Relating to Collegiate Educational Facilities in California.*

This bulletin contains basic factual information relating to the area and population of the state, growth and dispersion of population, the ability of the state to support education, school enrollments on various levels and in various types of tax-supported institutions, and the extent to which existing institutions serve the areas in which they are situated and meet educational demands. Eleven figures and 37 tables are included.

No. 1, January 1, 1933. *Statistics of California Junior Colleges for the School Year Ending June 30, 1933.*

There are presented in this bulletin basic statistical data relating to California junior colleges during the school year 1931-1932. The material consists for the most part of tabulations compiled from the annual reports of junior college principals. Several tables have been included to show the growth of the junior college movement in California over a period of years.

HIGH SCHOOL TEXTBOOK LISTING

There has been prepared a statement of all books listed for use as textbooks in California high schools since the last list published which appeared in the April, 1932, number of *California Schools*. This statement will be sent within a short time to all principals of high schools and junior high schools and to county and city superintendents of schools.

Division of Adult and Continuation Education

L. B. TRAVERS, Chief

PUBLICITY METHODS IN ADULT EDUCATION

It has been recognized for some years that a successful program of education must be closely integrated with the life of the community which it attempts to serve. This is particularly true of a program of adult education which must be organized not only to meet the social and economic needs of adults, but must be presented to them in such a way that they recognize its value.

To do this adequately requires a technical knowledge concerning the preparation of announcements, reports, and publicity material in such a way that they will be read by those who are in need of this service.

For this reason the Division of Adult and Continuation Education is sponsoring a correspondence course of 15 lessons in Publicity Methods in Adult Education which should be of value to any local administrator, principal, or supervisor of any part of our adult education program. The course is being offered by the University College, University of Southern California, Transportation Building, Los Angeles, California. A full description of this course will be sent upon request to University College.

Division of Health and Physical Education

N. P. NEILSON, Chief

GOOD FOOD FOR LITTLE MONEY

Children must have proper food during their growing years and the choice of food must not be left to chance. To satisfy hunger is not enough. If children do not have the essentials for normal growth and development at this time there is grave danger that they will suffer physically in later years.

Good Food for Little Money to Protect the Health of Children is the title of a leaflet prepared by Lucy H. Gillett, and published by the American Child Health Association, 450 Seventh Avenue, New York, N. Y. The leaflet is obtainable at the following prices which include postage:

1 to 3 copies	-----	\$.03	each
4 to 9 copies	-----	.01	each
10 to 24 copies	-----	.008	each
25 to 99 copies	-----	.007	each
100 copies	-----	.50	
500 copies	-----	2.25	
1000 to 5000 copies cost \$3.50 per thousand, f.o.b. New York. Larger quantity prices on request.			

INTERPRETATIONS OF SCHOOL LAW

Supreme Court Decisions

Expenditure of District Fund for School Buildings

Under School Code section 4.375 and within the limits prescribed by that section, the governing board of a school district may expend funds levied for the purpose of building school houses or for the purchase or sale of school lands without a vote of the district authorizing such action. The intent of School Code sections 6.40, 6.100, and 4.375 is that such expenditures are optional within the said limits and compulsory when required by a vote of the district.

(*Los Angeles City School District of Los Angeles County vs. Payne*, 84 C. D. 497, denying application for rehearing of *Los Angeles City School District of Los Angeles County vs. Payne*, 84 C. D. 420.)

Tenure of Teachers and Principals in Day and Evening Schools

The Supreme Court denied applications for hearing after judgment in the Appellate Court of *Cullen vs. Board of Education of the City and County of San Francisco et al.* (71 C. A. D. 219) and *Anderson vs. Board of Education of the City and County of San Francisco et al.* (71 C. A. D. 221), but withheld approval of that portion of the opinion of the Appellate Court in each of the two mentioned cases which holds that the two employments of each of the petitioners constituted but one position.

(*Cullen vs. Board of Education of the City and County of San Francisco et al.*, 84 C. D. 502, ---- Pac. ----, *Anderson vs. Board of Education of the City and County of San Francisco et al.*, 84 C. D. 502.)

FOR YOUR INFORMATION

MEETING OF STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

The State Board of Education will hold its joint annual meeting with state teachers college presidents in Chico, January 5, 1933. The regular quarterly meeting of the board will be held in Sacramento, January 6 and 7.

EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTS

Education at the Cross Roads

The State Department of Education is continuing its broadcasts, Education at the Cross Roads. This series of broadcasts is being released over KPO, San Francisco; KECA, Los Angeles; KJR, Seattle; KGA, Spokane; KGIR, Butte, Montana; KGHL, Billings, Montana, on Saturdays at 6:30 p.m.

The objectives of these broadcasts are to acquaint the public and particularly parents with the educational services rendered by the schools and the best way to aid in bringing about better educational services.

Administrators are requested to give local publicity to these programs in order that the messages will reach as many parents as possible. Future broadcasts will be listed in the February number of *California Schools*.

The following are the broadcasts for January and February:

January 7—WHO PAYS FOR OUR SCHOOLS?

An interview between Walter E. Morgan, Assistant Superintendent of Public Instruction and Chief, Division of Research and Statistics, and Ira W. Kibby, Chief, Bureau of Business Education.

January 14—WHAT DO THE PEOPLE RECEIVE FROM THEIR INVESTMENT IN PUBLIC EDUCATION?

An interview between Walter E. Morgan, Assistant Superintendent of Public Instruction and Chief, Division of Research and Statistics, and F. C. Muncy, Assistant Chief, Division of Research and Statistics.

January 21—WHAT SHOULD I EXPECT MY CHILD TO GET OUT OF HIGH SCHOOL?

An interview between Nicholas Ricciardi, Chief, Division of Secondary Education and N. P. Nielsen, Chief, Division of Health and Physical Education.

January 28—WHAT IS THE VALUE OF RURAL SUPERVISION IN EDUCATION?

Helen Heffernan, Chief, Division of Elementary Education and Rural Schools.

February 4—WHAT IS THE CALIFORNIA PLAN FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION?

J. C. Beswick, Chief, Bureau of Trade and Industrial Education and
Ira W. Kibby, Chief, Bureau of Business Education.

February 11—WHAT ARE THE PURPOSES OF SECONDARY EDUCATION?

Nicholas Ricciardi, Chief, Division of Secondary Education.

February 18—WHAT ARE THE PURPOSES OF ELEMENTARY EDUCATION?

Helen Heffernan, Chief, Division of Elementary Education and
Rural Schools.

February 25—WHAT ARE THE PURPOSES OF JUNIOR COLLEGE EDUCATION?

Nicholas Ricciardi, Chief Division of Secondary Education.

San Diego State Teachers College Biweekly Broadcasts

Faculty and students at San Diego State Teachers College each have a weekly aerial outlet initiated and managed by H. C. Steinmetz, extension director. The faculty lecture period over KGB, Wednesdays, 4:30-4:45 p.m., will complete its first year of uninterrupted presentation on January 20, 1933. The student entertainment period over KFSD, Thursdays 8:45-9:15 or 9:30 p.m., began nearly a year ago but did not continue during the summer.

Faculty talks have usually been organized into continuities of four on recent developments in science, current international affairs, know your college, contemporary literature, interspersed with seasonally significant lectures and appeals on matters of state educational importance.

The broadcasts have become something of a community institution, and the director is now preparing a series of lectures upon a single topic to be offered by one person as a non-credit extension course. Student managers and announcers are trained and used at each broadcast. Six have gained experience and three have secured employment.

Education for the New World

Florence Hale, First Vice-president and Radio Chairman, National Education Association, is directing a series of broadcasts entitled "Education for the New World." These broadcasts are being released over the National Broadcasting Company network on Sundays at 3:30 over Pacific coast stations, KPO, San Francisco; KGA, Spokane; KJR, Seattle; KEX, Portland; KECA, Los Angeles; KFSD, San Diego; KDYL, Salt Lake City; KGIR, Butte, Montana; KGHL, Billings, Montana.

January will bring such speakers as Dr. Rollo Reynolds, Principal of the Horace Mann School, New York, N. Y.; U. S. Senator Arthur Capper of Kansas; and Dr. Payson Smith, State Commisisoner of Education of Massachusetts. This is the third series of broadcasts under the auspices of the National Education Association, Washington, D. C.

Mindways: Stories of Human Behavior

On Thursdays between 4:15 and 4:30 p.m., Dr. Virgil E. Dickson, Director of Research, Berkeley Public Schools, and Dr. Herbert Stolz, Chief, Bureau of Parent Education, State Department of Education, are conducting a broadcast of psychological talks on child behavior. The content for these talks is taken from character studies made by Dr. Dickson and Dr. Stolz in their laboratories at Berkeley. This broadcast is being released over the KPO network.

Safety Education

The California State Chamber of Commerce is conducting a broadcast featuring a campaign of safety education for street and highway traffic. This broadcast is being released on Mondays from 5:00 to 5:15 p.m. over stations KPO, KGA, KJR. This program offers an opportunity for teachers to motivate their safety education instruction by requesting children to listen to these broadcasts and discuss them in class the next day.

The Economic World Today

The series of round table discussions on current economic problems by prominent economists, newspaper men, and others will continue over Pacific coast stations KPO, KGA, KJR, KFSD, KTAR, KDYL, KGIR, KGHL from 5:30 to 6:00 p.m., Pacific standard time. The following program will be given:

February 4, Basic Difficulties in Agriculture—Edwin G. Nourse, Director, Institute of Economics, Brookings Institution.

February 11, The Farmer Never Quits—Edwin G. Nourse.

REPORT OF CALIFORNIA TAX RESEARCH BUREAU

The printed report of the California Tax Research Bureau provided for by an act of the 1931 Legislature has recently been made available. This report contains factual information with reference to the distribution of tax burdens on various forms of wealth and presents certain recommendations. The report is deserving of careful study by school administrators. Copies may be secured upon request to the California State Board of Equalization, Sacramento.

THRIFT WEEK

Thrift Week, the opening day of which always occurs on the birthday of America's apostle of thrift, Benjamin Franklin, takes place from January 17 to 23, 1933. For school observance, the study of diligence, prudence, foresight, comfort, responsibility, sympathy,

and duty is suggested as tending toward the cultivation of thrift habits among the youth of our country.

COLUMBIA SCHOLASTIC PRESS ASSOCIATION

The ninth annual contest and convention of the Columbia Scholastic Press Association will be held at Columbia University March 9-11, 1933. The final date of entry for school newspapers in the contest is January 14, while the final entry date for magazines is February 4, 1933.

The Columbia Scholastic Press Association includes publications from elementary, junior and senior high schools, junior colleges, and normal schools and acts as a clearing house for information concerning the publication of a school paper. The association will be glad to supply school papers with articles on general or particular phases of the subject or digests of articles which appear in *The School Press Review*, official journal of the association.

OLD IRONSIDES EN ROUTE TO THE PACIFIC COAST

The *U. S. S. Constitution (Old Ironsides)* which has been cruising on the Atlantic coast is now en route to the west coast of the United States and will arrive in San Diego February 5, 1933.

Since the restoration of the famous old vessel was made possible by generous contributions from boys and girls in schools throughout the country, the Secretary of the Navy wishes the widest publicity given to the itinerary of the *U. S. S. Constitution*. From the following itinerary it will be noted that the ship will remain in the various ports long enough to permit the school children in the vicinity to pay her a visit and see for themselves what their many small contributions have accomplished.

<i>Arrive</i>	<i>Port</i>	<i>Depart</i>
February 5	San Diego	February 27
February 28	San Pedro	March 20
March 22	San Francisco	April 12
April 12	Oakland	April 26
April 26	Vallejo	May 2
July 22	San Francisco	July 28
July 30	San Pedro	August 7
August 8	San Diego	August 15

PROFESSIONAL LITERATURE

REVIEWS

LEONARD V. KOOS and GRAYSON N. KEFAUVER. *Guidance in Secondary Schools*. New York: The Macmillon Company, 1932. xi + 640 pp.

One of the features which distinguish the modern secondary school from that of a few decades ago is the acceptance of the function of guidance. The modern secondary school program includes a guidance program designed to furnish educational and vocational direction to each pupil in accordance with his own individual needs, interests, and capacities. Much has been written concerning guidance during recent years. There are many magazine articles, monographs, and books dealing with specific phases of educational and vocational guidance. There are but few books, however, which attempt to cover the whole field of guidance in the secondary school in a comprehensive and complete manner. This new book by Koos and Kefauver very satisfactorily meets the need for a book of this type and scope.

In the introductory chapter on The Need and Scope of Guidance, it is shown that the growing universality of secondary education and the resultant diversity of the secondary school population has been one of the chief factors contributing to the necessity for the guidance function in secondary schools. The concept of guidance as developed in this chapter is not restricted to the narrow field of vocational guidance nor yet is it extended to make guidance synonymous with education. While the authors have refrained from offering any brief or simple definition of guidance, they have described its meaning in terms of its scope. Two phases of guidance are pointed out: (1) the distinctive phase in which the aim is to "distribute youth as effectively as possible to educational and vocational opportunities," and (2) the adjustive phase with the purpose "to help the individual to make the optional adjustment to educational and vocational situations." Guidance is conceived as incompatible with coercion and concerned rather with giving advice and furnishing factual information to aid the individual in making his own choices.

The remaining 20 chapters are organized in four main divisions: Part I, Informing Students Concerning Opportunities; Part II, Securing Information Concerning Students; Part III, Guiding the Individual Student; and Part IV, Organizing Guidance Service.

The core of the content was provided by a study of guidance practice in nearly 400 secondary schools (47 junior high schools, 52 six-year high schools, 70 senior high schools, 167 four-year high schools, and 52 junior colleges) located in nearly every state and representing a wide variety of type and sizes of school. The authors found that selection operated to a considerable extent to exclude from the study those schools in which there was but little of a guidance program. The study, therefore, is not of representative practice but rather of the better practice now found in secondary schools.

In addition to the data of this study, the book endeavors to incorporate the best materials to be found in current literature on guidance and also presents the findings of studies carried on by advanced students in the authors' classes.

This book represents an excellent survey of guidance practice in schools which have attempted to establish adequate guidance programs. Although admitting the impossibility of adequately evaluating the practices described, the authors have in certain instances appraised specific phases of guidance programs.

A wealth of factual information is presented, 67 tables and 57 figures being included. Extensive reference is made to original sources throughout the book. At the end of each chapter is a well prepared list of questions and problems on the subject of the chapter and a carefully selected list of references.

It is, of course, impossible in a single volume to treat any one of the phases or topics included in an exhaustive or highly detailed manner. The authors have succeeded admirably in their purpose to develop a comprehensive treatment of the whole field.

The book is a most welcome addition to the literature of guidance and should find a place in the professional library of every teacher and administrator interested in guidance in secondary schools.

IVAN R. WATERMAN

PHILIP W. L. COX and FORREST E. LONG. *Principles of Secondary Education*. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1932. viii + 620 pp.

A unique treatment of the principles of secondary education appears in a new book on this subject by Cox and Long. The authors have departed from the usual method of organization followed in textbooks on secondary education and have stated 25 "principles of secondary education" each of which constitutes the basis of discussion for a chapter of the book. The 25 principles are organized under four headings as follows: Part I, The Institution; Part II, The Pupil; Part III, The Curriculum; and Part IV, Changing Conceptions of secondary Education.

As examples of the statements of principles enunciated and discussed by the authors, the first principle in each of the four parts is here reproduced.

Principle I. The American high school is a consciously controlled environment—common, free, tax-supported, non-sectarian, and state-controlled—open to all children of early and middle adolescence. Here pupils undergo such experiences and develop such habits, attitudes, and ideas that an industrial civilization may be assured of stability and may give direction to its own progress from generation to generation.

Principle IV. High school procedures, to be effective, must conform to the laws of learning.

Principle IX. The secondary school curriculum should comprise all activities and experiences fostered by the school which prepare children for early and middle adolescence for participation in social life and which have for every individual the maximum self-realization consonant with the welfare of the group.

Principle XX. A new conception of secondary education must take the form—the conception that it is the function of the public high school to meet the educational needs of adolescence as it is the function of the elementary school to meet the needs of childhood.

Although organized in a far different manner, this book treats most of the topics usually included in a textbook on secondary education. Throughout the book emphasis is placed on the theory underlying modern secondary school practice. It is highly interpretative rather than expository and lacks the amount of illustrative material and practical application found in other textbooks. The form of organization under 25 principles has led to much overlapping and has prevented a logical presentation under topics that are relatively exclusive.

The book seems to assume somewhat of a background in educational theory and in secondary education. For these reasons, in the opinion of the reviewer, it is more appropriate for the advanced student or the experienced teacher and administrator. If used as a textbook for beginning courses in secondary education, as the authors have intended, it should be supplemented by a text organization along the usual lines or by a large body of supplementary reference material.

The strength of the book lies in its critical interpretation of the function of secondary education in modern civilization. It challenges the reader to make his own applications and further interpretations of contemporary educational practice. In serving these purposes the book is a valuable contribution to educators.

IVAN R. WATERMAN

CURRENT PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

- COUNTS, GEORGE SYLVESTER. *Dare the School Build a New Social Order?* New York: The John Day Co., 1932.
- Course of Study in Safety Education for All Grades*, A. *Bulletin* 1932, No. 15. State of Alabama Department of Education. Montgomery, Alabama: The Wilson Printing Co., 1932.
- DAVIS, ELWOOD CRAIG. *Methods and Techniques Used in Surveying Health and Physical Education in City Schools*. New York: Teachers College. Columbia University. Contributions to Education, No. 515. 1932.
- HORNE, HERMAN HARNELL. *The Democratic Philosophy of Education*. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1932.
- KUNZIG, ROBERT W. *Public School Education of Atypical Children*. *United States Department of the Interior, Office of Education Bulletin*, 1931, No. 10. Washington, D. C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1932.
- LINDEGREN, ALINA M. *Institutions of Higher Education in Sweden*. *United States Department of the Interior, Office of Education. Pamphlet No. 32, July, 1932*. Washington, D. C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1932.
- MABIE, ETHEL. *Language Development in Primary Grades Through School Activities*. Bloomington, Illinois: Public School Publishing Co., 1930.
- MATHIAS, MARGARET E. *The Teaching of Art*. New York: Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1932.
- Parent Education: the Third Yearbook*. Washington, D. C.: National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 1932.
- School Library Yearbook. Number Five*. Compiled by The School Libraries Committee of the American Library Association. Chicago: American Library Association, 1932.
- Tax Exemption in Nebraska*. *Nebraska Studies in Business No. 32*. Compiled by the Committee on Business Research of the College of Business Administration of the University of Nebraska. No. 99, November, 1932.
- Teachers College Bulletin. Report of the Dean of Teachers College for the Year Ending June 03, 1932*. Twenty-fourth Series, No. 1, November, 1932. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- THORNDIKE, EDWARD LEE. *The Fundamentals of Learning*. New York: Bureau of Publications. Teachers College. Columbia University, 1932.
- TROXELL, ELEANOR. *Language and Literature in the Kindergarten and Primary Grades*. New York: Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1927.
- WALLER, WILLARD. *The Sociology of Teaching*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1932.
- WHEELER, RAYMOND HOLDER, and PERKINS, FRANCIS THEODORE. *Principles of Mental Development: a Textbook in Educational Psychology*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1932.
- WILLIAMS, JESSE FEIRING, and NIXON, EUGENE WHITE. *The Athlete in the Making*. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders Co., 1932.
- WILLIAMS, JESSE FEIRING. *Methods in Physical Education*. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders Co., 1932.

MAGAZINE ARTICLES

- ADAMS, W. L. "Why Teachers Say They Fail Pupils." *Educational Administration and Supervision*, pp. 594-600, Vol. VIII, November, 1932, No. 8.
- BRAMMEL, P. ROY. "Looking Ahead in Secondary-School Athletics." *The School Review*, pp. 735-750, Vol. XL, December, 1932, No. 10.
- FITZGERALD, JAMES A. "Words Misspelled Most Frequently by Children of the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Grade Levels in Life Outside the School." *Journal of Educational Research*, pp. 213-218, Vol. XXVI, November, 1932, No. 3.
- LAURIE, HELEN. "Units of Work and Reading." *The Elementary School Journal*, pp. 215-226, Vol. XXXIII, November, 1932, No. 3.
- LIDE, EDWIN S. "Plans for Curriculum-Making in Secondary Schools." *The School Review*, pp. 751-759, Vol. XL, December, 1932, No. 10.
- SANGREN, PAUL V. "Reduction of Overlapping in Courses in Education." *Educational Administration and Supervision*, pp. 601-606, Vol. VIII, November, 1932, No. 8.
- SEARS, JESSE B. "The Administration of Public School Research Policies." *Journal of Educational Research*, pp. 186-198, Vol. XXVI, November, 1932, No. 3.
- SHELDON, DONALD R. "Children's Interests." *The Elementary School Journal*, pp. 205-214, Vol. XXXIII, November, 1932, No. 3.
- TUGWELL, REXFORD G. "Discourse in Depression." *Teachers College Record*, pp. 89-109, Vol. XXXIV, No. 2, November, 1932.
- WAITS, LOGAN ABNER. "A Study of the Comparative Efficiency of Single and Married Women as Teachers." *Educational Administration and Supervision*, pp. 630-633, Vol. VIII, November, 1932, No. 8.
- WORTON, J. T. "Shall We Eliminate the Comparative Marking System from the Report Card?" *The Elementary School Journal*, pp. 176-184, Vol. XXXIII, November, 1932, No. 3.